UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/527,287	10/527,287 03/08/2005 Klemens Breitfuss		AT02 0058 US	2726
65913 NXP , B.V.	7590 03/17/201	EXAMINER		
NXP INTELLE	ECTUAL PROPERTY	SYED, NABIL H		
M/S41-SJ 1109 MCKAY DRIVE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAN JOSE, CA	95131	2612		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/17/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/527,287	BREITFUSS ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
NABIL H. SYED	2612	

	NABIL H. SYED	2612	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>28 February 2011</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A			
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavited (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth to ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (a). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejectio	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the siset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of the corresponding a	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	of the date of appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the	isideration and/or search (see NOTw); er form for appeal by materially rec	TE below); ducing or simplifying th	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allended non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: None. Claim(s) objected to: None.	cowable if submitted in a separate, t will not be entered, or b) will	timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 and 3-23</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Note below.		condition for allowand	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Brian A Zimmerman/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2612	/NABIL H SYED/ Examiner Art Unit: 2612		

Note: Applicant's arguments filed 2/2/811 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Examiner maintains the rejection made in the final rejection. Applicant admits that in Ooya "if the data transmission detection unit 208 (of the slave unit) does not detect transmission of a response signal from another slave station and the time has reached the start time of the determined delayed time, the control unit 202 transmits an ID response signal containing the ID of the slave stations (see remarks, page 8, lines 26-29). Ooya further discloses that the slave stations C501 and D 601 do not transmit the ID response signals since the data transmission detection unit 208 of the slave stations C 501 and D 601 detect transmission of the ID response signal by the slave stations B 401 (see col. 5, lines 1-5; also see fig. 3).). So based on this description of Ooya it can be seen whenever slave stations is about to begin transmitting its ID response signal it will check first if there is another slave station transmitting, which can be interpreted as performing a test, to determine whether another slave station is transmitting a response signal (see fig. 3, slave stations 401, 501 and 601).

In order to further support the arguments, that the technique of carrier sensing before transmitting a response signal is a well known Steeves discloses an interrogation system, wherein a tag that is preparing to transmit will listen for a pattern from another transmitting tag and if the detection indicates a very crowded RF environment the tag determines not to initiate transmission since it is highly probable that such transmission would take place tat the same time as transmission from another tag and might therefore not be properly received by a reader (see col. 8, lines 44 through col. 9, lines 3). Note: Steeves is not used to reject the claim it is merely used to indicate that the technique of carries sensing before transmission is a well known technique in the art.

Based on the explanation given above it is the Examiner's postion that the reference applied disclsoes the invention as claimed in the present application.